

Extended quintessence, inflation, and stable de Sitter spaces

Valerio Faraoni and Michael N. Jensen

*Physics Department, Bishop's University
Lennoxville, Québec, Canada J1M 1Z7*

Abstract

A new gauge-invariant criterion for stability against inhomogeneous perturbations of de Sitter space is applied to scenarios of dark energy and inflation in scalar-tensor gravity. The results extend previous studies.

PACS: 98.80.-k, 04.90.+e, 04.50.+h

Keywords: dark energy, extended quintessence, inflation, de Sitter space

1 Introduction

Recent studies of type Ia Supernovae [1] have demonstrated that the expansion of the universe is accelerated. In the context of Einstein gravity this can only be due to an exotic form of energy called dark energy or quintessence with negative pressure, which dominates the cosmic dynamics [2]. The best fit of the observational data from cosmic microwave background experiments [3] fixes the energy density of dark energy to be $\Omega_{de} = 0.7$ in units of the critical density, with matter accounting for $\Omega_m \simeq 0.3$, mostly composed of dark matter. The best fit of the observational data also favours a time-varying form of dark energy [4] and there is marginal evidence for a negative equation of state parameter $w \equiv P/\rho < -1$, where P and ρ are the energy density and pressure of the dark energy, respectively [4].

Most models of dark energy are based on scalar fields, which are natural candidates from the theoretical point of view because it is well known from the inflationary theory of the primordial universe [5] that a scalar field ϕ slowly rolling in a nearly flat section of its self-interaction potential $V(\phi)$ can fuel a period of accelerated expansion of the universe. However, a single canonical scalar field in Einstein gravity cannot explain the range of values $w < -1$ of the equation of state parameter preferred by the observations [6, 7]. In fact, a canonical scalar field ϕ in general relativity has energy density and pressure

$$\rho = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V(\phi), \quad P = \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V(\phi), \quad (1.1)$$

where an overdot denotes differentiation with respect to the comoving time t . In the spatially flat Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) \quad (1.2)$$

in comoving coordinates (t, x, y, z) , the Einstein-Friedmann equation

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\kappa}{2}(\rho + P) \quad (1.3)$$

(where $\kappa \equiv 8\pi G$ and $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter) implies that $w < -1$ is equivalent to $\dot{H} > 0$, a regime called *superacceleration* as opposed to acceleration $\ddot{a}/a = \dot{H} + H^2 > 0$. Then, eq. (1.3) yields $\dot{H} = -\kappa\dot{\phi}^2/2 \leq 0$, with the upper bound of the inequality being attained by de Sitter spaces with $H = \text{const.}$ A regime with $\dot{H} > 0$ (or $w < -1$) requires an extension of the theory [6]. One possibility that has received much attention in the literature [8, 9, 10] is that of phantom fields, i.e., the scalar ϕ is formally allowed to have a negative kinetic energy and $\dot{\phi}^2/2$ is replaced by $-\dot{\phi}^2/2$ in

eq. (1.3). This modification allows for dynamics capable of breaking the $w < -1$ barrier. Motivations for phantom fields arise in string/M theory and in supergravity [11].

Another possibility [12] is to allow the scalar ϕ to couple nonminimally to the Ricci curvature through the action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - \xi \phi^2 \right) \frac{R}{2} - \frac{1}{2} g^{ab} \nabla_a \phi \nabla_b \phi - V(\phi) \right]. \quad (1.4)$$

Both phantom and non-minimally coupled scalar field models can be seen as scalar-tensor theories of gravity. Scalar-tensor models of dark energy (called *extended quintessence*) were considered even before the observational evidence for superacceleration was reported [12] (see Refs. [13, 14] for reviews of cosmology in scalar-tensor gravity). Perhaps the most striking consequence of superacceleration is that the universe may end its existence in a Big Rip singularity at a finite time in the future [9]. Whether a Big Rip is unavoidable or another fate awaits the late universe is determined by the presence and size of the attraction basins of Big Rip solutions and/or other late time attractors in the phase space of the dark energy model. In certain models the universe eventually exits the superacceleration regime and converges to a de Sitter attractor, expanding for an infinite time [15]. In other models the Big Rip is the only late time attractor (e.g., [16, 17]).

In this paper we study the stability of de Sitter solutions (when they exist) in extended quintessence. The generalized gravity action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{f(\phi, R)}{2} - \frac{\omega(\phi)}{2} g^{ab} \nabla_a \phi \nabla_b \phi - V(\phi) \right] \quad (1.5)$$

contains scalar-tensor gravity as the special case in which the function $f(\phi, R)$ is linear in R . The field equations in the FLRW metric (1.2) are

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3F} \left(\frac{\omega}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{RF}{2} - \frac{f}{2} + V - 3H\dot{F} \right), \quad (1.6)$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2F} \left(\omega \dot{\phi}^2 + \ddot{F} - H\dot{F} \right), \quad (1.7)$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{1}{2\omega} \left(\frac{d\omega}{d\phi} \dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi} + 2 \frac{dV}{d\phi} \right) = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where $F \equiv \partial f / \partial R$. The Hubble parameter H is a cosmological observable and the scalar ϕ is a natural dynamical variable to consider, hence we take H and ϕ as physical

variables. Then the only equilibrium points of the dynamical system (1.6)-(1.8) are de Sitter spaces with constant scalar field (H_0, ϕ_0) and they exist subject to the two conditions

$$6H_0^2 F_0 - f_0 + 2V_0 = 0, \quad (1.9)$$

$$f_0' - 2V_0' = 0, \quad (1.10)$$

where $F_0 \equiv F(H_0, \phi_0)$, $f_0 \equiv f(\phi_0, R_0)$, $V_0 \equiv V(\phi_0)$, $V_0' \equiv \frac{dV}{d\phi}\big|_{\phi_0}$, $f_0' \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi}\big|_{(\phi_0, R_0)}$, and $R_0 = 12H_0^2$. Equations (1.9) and (1.10) are straightforward to derive from eqs. (1.6)-(1.8) and appeared in the literature before for various special choices of the function $f(\phi, R)$ [18]-[21]. There are only two conditions because only two equations in this set are independent. The stability of these de Sitter spaces is usually assessed with respect to homogeneous (time-dependent only) perturbations; in Ref. [22] we studied stability with respect to inhomogeneous (space- and time-dependent) perturbations, to linear order. The difficulty with inhomogeneous perturbations is related to their gauge-dependence and to deal with this problem we used the covariant and gauge-invariant formalism of Bardeen, Ellis, Bruni, Hwang and Vishniac [23], in the formulation given by Hwang and Hwang and Noh for generalized gravity [24]. We found that, when $\phi_0 \neq 0$, the de Sitter fixed point $(H_0, \phi_0) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{f_0 - 2V_0}{6F_0}}, \phi_0\right)$ is stable if and only if

$$\frac{\left(\frac{f_0''}{2} - V_0'' + \frac{6(H_0 f_{\phi R})^2}{F_0}\right)}{\omega_0 \left(1 + \frac{3f_{\phi R}^2}{2\omega_0 F_0}\right)} \leq 0 \quad (1.11)$$

(see Refs. [18, 19, 25, 20] for similar conditions in generalized gravity). A different formula applies if $\phi_0 = 0$ but we will not be concerned with this case here, while contracting de Sitter fixed points with $H_0 = -\sqrt{\frac{f_0 - 2V_0}{6F_0}}$ are always unstable [22]. We refer the reader to the Appendix for a sketch of the derivation of the stability criterion (1.11), and to Ref. [22] for a detailed discussion.

Our goal is to apply the stability condition (1.11) to extended quintessence scenarios that appeared recently in the literature and to scalar-tensor inflationary scenarios of the early universe [26].

2 Non-minimally coupled quintessence

We begin with the extended quintessence model of Carvalho & Saa [27] based on a non-minimally coupled scalar field and described by

$$f(\phi, R) = (1 - \xi\phi^2)R, \quad \omega \equiv 1, \quad V(\phi) = A e^{-\sigma\phi}. \quad (2.1)$$

where $\xi < 0$ is a dimensionless coupling constant, A and σ are positive constants, and units are used in which $\kappa = 8\pi G = 1$. Equations (1.9) and (1.10) for the existence of de Sitter fixed points (H_0, ϕ_0) yield

$$H_0^2 = \frac{V_0}{3(1 - \xi\phi_0^2)} = \frac{\sigma A e^{-\sigma\phi_0}}{12\xi\phi_0}, \quad \phi_0^{(\pm)} = -\frac{2}{\sigma} \left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{4\xi}} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

which correspond to eqs. (14) and (13) of Ref. [27], respectively. These authors consider the range of values of the coupling constant $\xi < -\sigma^2/4$, and $\phi_0^\pm < 0$. The criterion for stability (1.11) in the theory (2.1) reduces to the one previously found in Ref. [28] and can be written as

$$V_0'' \geq \varphi(x) \frac{V_0'}{\phi_0}, \quad x = \xi\phi_0^2, \quad \varphi(x) = \frac{1 - 3x}{1 - x}, \quad (2.3)$$

if $\phi_0 \neq 0$. It is convenient to use the variable $y \equiv \frac{\sigma^2}{4|\xi|}$ with $0 < y < 1$. In the case of the fixed point

$$(H_0, \phi_0^{(-)}) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{V_0}{3[1 - \xi(\phi_0^{(-)})^2]}}, -\frac{2}{\sigma} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{4\xi}} \right) \right), \quad (2.4)$$

the stability condition (2.3) simply reduces to

$$1 - y + \sqrt{1 - y} \geq 0 \quad (2.5)$$

which is always satisfied, hence this equilibrium point is stable against linear inhomogeneous perturbations. This conclusion complements the work of Carvalho and Saa [27] who consider only homogeneous perturbations but to arbitrary order by exhibiting a suitable Ljapunov function. On the one hand their approach provides information on the attraction basin; on the other hand, our approach takes into account the more general inhomogeneous perturbations by tackling the gauge-dependence problems. Regarding the parameter space, Carvalho and Saa only prove stability analytically for

$-5/6 < \xi < -\sigma^2/4$, although they conjecture stability for a much larger range of values of this parameter on the basis of numerical integrations probing down to values $\xi < -100$. Our approach instead establishes linear stability analytically for any $\xi < -\sigma^2/4$. It is to be noted however that the values of σ and ξ are not arbitrary: they are subject to bounds placed by observational constraints on the variability of the effective gravitational coupling $G_{eff}(\phi) = G(1 - 8\pi G \xi \phi^2)^{-1}$ [29].

The second fixed point $(H_0, \phi_0^{(+)})$ is found to be unstable against homogeneous perturbations in Ref. [27]; this is of course true also for inhomogeneous perturbations. In fact the stability condition (2.3) reduces to $y(1 - y) \leq 0$, which is never satisfied because y only assumes values in the range $0 < y < 1$.

The constraints on the variation of G_{eff} mentioned above [29] do not apply to inflation but they are relevant to more recent epochs of the cosmic history (e.g., during galaxy formation) and to scenarios of dark energy in the present universe. Although most constraints depend on specific quintessence models or parametrizations of the variation of G_{eff} , the general feeling is that it is rather difficult to reconcile the available constraints on the variation of G_{eff} with a successful extended quintessence scenario. While the latter requires low energy scales, high energy scales are generally required to implement the modest variations of G_{eff} allowed. The realization of a successful extended quintessence scenario compatible with all the observational constraints and free of fine-tuning problems may in the end reveal to be very problematic [29] and this issue deserves further investigation.

3 Inflation with non-minimal coupling

The approach presented here is suitable to study also the stability of de Sitter-like inflation in scalar-tensor gravity; in this context the presence of a de Sitter attractor justifies the use of the slow-roll approximation to inflation in the early universe [5]. We turn our attention to the recent non-minimally coupled scalar field inflationary models of Refs. [30]-[32] (see also [33]) which employ the power-law potential $V(\phi) = C\phi^p$. The conditions (1.9) and (1.10) for the existence of de Sitter fixed points (H_0, ϕ_0) yield

$$H_0^2 = \frac{C(2-p)\phi_0^p}{6(1+\xi\phi_0^2)} = -\frac{C}{12}p^{p/2}(p-4)^{1-p/2}\xi^{-p/2}, \quad \phi_0^2 = \frac{p}{(p-4)\xi}. \quad (3.1)$$

These expressions correspond, e.g., to eqs. (3.4) and (3.5) of Ref. [32]. If $\xi < 0$ it must be $0 \leq p < 4$ for the existence of these fixed points while if $\xi > 0$ it must be $p \leq 0$ or $p > 4$. The stability condition (2.3) yields, assuming a positive effective gravitational

coupling, i.e., $1 - \xi \phi_0^2 > 0$,

$$\phi_0^2 \leq \frac{2-p}{(4-p)\xi} . \quad (3.2)$$

By using the expression of ϕ_0^2 in (3.1) and remembering the condition for the existence of de Sitter space, one concludes that:

- If $\xi > 0$ and $p \leq 0$ the fixed point (H_0, ϕ_0) is *stable*.
- If $\xi > 0$ and $p > 4$ this fixed point is *stable*.
- If $\xi > 0$ and $0 < p \leq 4$ this fixed point is *unstable*.
- If $\xi < 0$ and $0 \leq p \leq 4$ this fixed point is *unstable*.

Therefore, de Sitter attractors exist in phase space for $\xi > 0$ and for $p \leq 0$ and $p > 4$. The requirement that the de Sitter point be an attractor does not constrain ξ apart from its sign, but the spectrum of density perturbations generated during inflation does set constraints on ξ for various choices of the power p [34].

4 Induced gravity inflation

We now turn our attention to induced gravity [35], which has been used as the context for both dark energy and inflationary models with power law potential [36, 37]. This theory is described by

$$f(\phi, R) = \epsilon \phi^2 R , \quad \omega \equiv 1 , \quad V(\phi) = C \phi^p . \quad (4.1)$$

Conformal coupling corresponds to $\epsilon = -1/6$. Here we restrict ourselves to considering positive gravitational coupling $\epsilon > 0$.¹ By using eqs. (1.9) and (1.10) one finds that

$$H_0^2 = \frac{(p-2) C \phi_0^{p-2}}{6\epsilon} \quad (4.2)$$

and it would appear that any power p in the potential gives an admissible de Sitter space, but further comparison with eq. (1.9), which assumes the form $-3\epsilon H_0^2 + C \phi_0^p = 0$ yields the result that de Sitter equilibrium points (H_0, ϕ_0) can only exist if $p = 4$. In this case, a mass term $m^2 \phi^2/2$ can not be added to the the potential if one wants to

¹For negative gravitational coupling $\epsilon < 0$ de Sitter solutions with the quartic potential $V = \lambda \phi^4/4$ exist only if $\lambda < 0$.

find de Sitter solutions and use them as inflationary attractors. For $V(\phi) = \lambda \phi^4/4$ the de Sitter fixed points are given by²

$$(H_0, \phi_0) = \left(\pm \sqrt{\frac{\lambda \phi_0^2}{12\epsilon}}, \phi_0 \right), \quad (4.3)$$

including the Minkowski space $(H_0, \phi_0) = (0, 0)$. Discarding the contracting de Sitter spaces with $H_0 < 0$ that are always unstable [22], the stability condition (1.11) reduces to $12\epsilon H_0^2 - \lambda \phi_0^2 \leq 0$. By using eq. (4.2) it is seen that this stability condition is always satisfied for $\epsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ and the fixed point $\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda \phi_0^2}{2\epsilon}}, \phi_0 \right)$ is stable, to first order, with respect to inhomogeneous perturbations. To the best of our knowledge, only stability against homogeneous perturbations was considered in the literature.

5 Conclusions

The criterion (1.11) for the stability of de Sitter space in scalar-tensor gravity allows one to quickly assess stability of de Sitter fixed points given the scalar-tensor Lagrangian of the theory, once conditions (1.9) and (1.10) establish their existence. The advantage of this stability condition is that it establishes stability with respect to the more general inhomogeneous perturbations and already incorporates a covariant and gauge-invariant treatment. By contrast, most studies of stability available in the literature are restricted to the less general homogeneous perturbations. The main limitation of the stability criterion (1.11) is that its validity is restricted to linear perturbations. While this suffices for most situations, second or higher order corrections would be needed, e.g., to analyze the backreaction of long wavelength perturbations on the de Sitter metric.

The simplification introduced by (1.11) in the stability analysis of de Sitter space is made clear by the scenarios discussed in this paper in which we can quickly recover the presence of de Sitter attractors in one scenario of extended quintessence and in two scalar-tensor inflationary scenarios, and extend the results of previous studies. There are other scenarios in the literature for which one would like to be reassured in a gauge-independent way about the stability of a crucial de Sitter attractor with respect to the more general inhomogeneous perturbations. These scenarios will be analyzed in future publications.

²This expression matches, e.g., eq. (7d) of Ref. [36].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Appendix: Derivation of the stability criterion (1.11)

Here the stability criterion (1.11) is derived using the covariant and gauge-invariant formalism of Bardeen in the form developed by Ellis, Bruni Hwang, and Vishniac [23]. A version of this formalism directly applicable to scalar-tensor gravity was given in Refs. [24]. The metric perturbations are defined by the equations

$$g_{00} = -a^2 (1 + 2AY) , \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$g_{0i} = -a^2 B Y_i , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$g_{ij} = a^2 [\gamma_{ij} (1 + 2H_L) + 2H_T Y_{ij}] , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the scalar harmonics satisfy the eigenvalue problem

$$\bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}^i Y = -k^2 Y , \quad (\text{A.4})$$

γ_{ij} are the components of the three-dimensional FLRW background metric, and $\bar{\nabla}_i$ is the covariant derivative of γ_{ij} . The defining relations for the vector and tensor harmonics Y_i and Y_{ij} are

$$Y_i = -\frac{1}{k} \bar{\nabla}_i Y , \quad Y_{ij} = \frac{1}{k^2} \bar{\nabla}_i \bar{\nabla}_j Y + \frac{1}{3} Y \gamma_{ij} . \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The variables used are the Bardeen potentials Φ_H and Φ_A and the Ellis-Bruni variable $\Delta\Phi$ given by [23]

$$\Phi_H = H_L + \frac{H_T}{3} + \frac{\dot{a}}{k} \left(B - \frac{a}{k} \dot{H}_T \right) , \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\Phi_A = A + \frac{\dot{a}}{k} \left(B - \frac{a}{k} \dot{H}_T \right) + \frac{a}{k} \left[\dot{B} - \frac{1}{k} \left(a \dot{H}_T \right) \right] , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\Delta\phi = \delta\phi + \frac{a}{k} \dot{\phi} \left(B - \frac{a}{k} \dot{H}_T \right) . \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The gauge-independent variables $\Delta F, \Delta f$, and ΔR are introduced by equations similar to eq. (A.8).

By specifying that the background spacetime is a de Sitter one, the perturbations satisfy, to first order, the equations

$$\Delta\phi = \delta\phi, \quad \Delta R = \delta R, \quad \Delta F = \delta F, \quad \Delta f = \delta f. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The first order equations ruling the evolution of these perturbations reduce to [22]

$$\Delta\ddot{\phi} + 3H_0\Delta\dot{\phi} + \left[\frac{k^2}{a^2} - \frac{1}{2\omega_0} (f_0'' - 2V_0'') \right] \Delta\phi = \frac{f_{\phi R}}{2\omega_0} \Delta R, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\Delta\ddot{F} + 3H_0\Delta\dot{F} + \left(\frac{k^2}{a^2} - 4H_0^2 \right) \Delta F + \frac{F_0}{3} \Delta R = 0, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$\ddot{H}_T + 3H_0\dot{H}_T + \frac{k^2}{a^2} H_T = 0, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$-\dot{\Phi}_H + H_0\Phi_A = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta\dot{F}}{F_0} - H_0 \frac{\Delta F}{F_0} \right), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$\Phi_H = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta F}{F_0}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$\Phi_A + \Phi_H = -\frac{\Delta F}{F_0}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\ddot{\Phi}_H + 3H_0\dot{\Phi}_H - H_0\dot{\Phi}_A - 3H_0^2\Phi_A = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta\ddot{F}}{F_0} - H_0 \frac{\Delta\dot{F}}{F_0} + \frac{3H_0^2}{2} \frac{\Delta F}{F_0}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where ΔR is now given by

$$\Delta R = 6 \left[\ddot{\Phi}_H + 4H_0\dot{\Phi}_H + \frac{2}{3} \frac{k^2}{a^2} \Phi_H - H_0\dot{\Phi}_A + \left(\frac{k^2}{3a^2} - 4H_0^2 \right) \Phi_A \right], \quad (\text{A.17})$$

and with the notations

$$f_{\phi R} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial\phi\partial R} \Big|_{(\phi_0, R_0)}, \quad f_0'' \equiv \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial\phi^2} \Big|_{(\phi_0, R_0)}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

By comparing eqs. (A.14) and (A.15) one obtains

$$\Phi_H = \Phi_A = -\frac{\Delta F}{2F_0}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Further substitution in eq. (A.17) yields

$$\Delta R = 6 \left[\ddot{\Phi}_H + 3H_0 \dot{\Phi}_H + \left(\frac{k^2}{a^2} - 4H_0^2 \right) \Phi_H \right]. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

The stability with respect to tensor perturbations was studied in Ref. [22], with the result that de Sitter space is always stable, to first order, with respect to these modes. The vorticity modes cannot be generated in scalar-tensor (or generalized) gravity theories when matter contributions are absent. There remain the scalar modes. We now restrict our attention to scalar-tensor gravity, for which $f(\phi, R)$ is linear in the Ricci curvature R . By using $\frac{\Delta F}{F_0} = \frac{f_{\phi R}}{F_0} \Delta\phi$, eq. (A.19) gives (see Ref. [22] for further details)

$$\Phi_H = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{f_{\phi R}}{F_0} \Delta\phi \quad (\text{A.21})$$

while

$$\Delta R = -\frac{3f_{\phi R}}{F_0} \left[\Delta\ddot{\phi} + 3H_0 \Delta\dot{\phi} + \left(\frac{k^2}{a^2} - 4H_0^2 \right) \Delta\phi \right]. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

from eqs. (A.20) and (A.21). This, and eq. (A.10), in turn yield

$$\Delta\ddot{\phi} + 3H_0 \Delta\dot{\phi} + \left[\frac{k^2}{a^2} - \frac{\left(\frac{f_0''}{2} - V_0'' + \frac{6f_{\phi R}^2}{F_0} H_0^2 \right)}{\omega_0 \left(1 + \frac{3f_{\phi R}^2}{2\omega_0 F_0} \right)} \right] \Delta\phi = 0 \quad (\text{A.23})$$

when $1 + 3f_{\phi R}^2/(2\omega_0 F_0) \neq 0$. When instead $1 + 3f_{\phi R}^2/(2\omega_0 F_0) = 0$, eq. (A.10) has either the trivial solution $\Delta\phi = 0$ or $f_0'' - 2V_0'' = 8\omega_0 H_0^2$.

The choice

$$\Delta\phi = \epsilon e^{\gamma t}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

provides solutions of the asymptotic form of eq. (A.23) at late times. Here ϵ and γ are constants and γ obeys the algebraic equation

$$\gamma^2 + 3H_0 \gamma + c = 0 \quad (\text{A.25})$$

with

$$c = -\frac{\left(\frac{f_0''}{2} - V_0'' + \frac{6f_{\phi R}^2}{F_0} H_0^2 \right)}{\omega_0 \left(1 + \frac{3f_{\phi R}^2}{2\omega_0 F_0} \right)}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

The roots of of eq. (A.26) are

$$\gamma_{\pm} = \frac{-3H_0 \pm \sqrt{9H_0^2 - 4c}}{2} . \quad (\text{A.27})$$

It is straightforward to see that $Re(\gamma_-) < 0$, while the sign of $Re(\gamma_+)$ depends on the sign of c . If $c \geq 0$ then $Re(\gamma_+) \leq 0$ and we have stability. If instead $c < 0$ then $Re(\gamma_+) > 0$ and de Sitter space is unstable. The condition for the stability of de Sitter space in the scalar-tensor theory (1.5) with $f(\phi, R)$ linear in R is therefore

$$\frac{\left(\frac{f_0''}{2} - V_0'' + \frac{6f_{\phi R}^2}{F_0} H_0^2\right)}{\omega_0 \left(1 + \frac{3f_{\phi R}^2}{2\omega_0 F_0}\right)} \leq 0 . \quad (\text{A.28})$$

References

- [1] Riess A G *et al.* 1998 *Astron. J.* **116** 1009; Perlmutter S *et al.* 1998, *Nature* **391** 51; Riess A G *et al.* 1999, *Astron. J.* **118** 2668; Perlmutter S *et al.* 1999, *Astrophys. J.* **517** 565; Riess A G *et al.* 2001, *Astrophys. J.* **560** 49; Tonry J L *et al.* 2003, *Astrophys. J.* **594** 1; Knop R *et al.* 2003, *Astrophys. J.* **598** 102; Riess A G *et al.* 2004, *Astrophys. J.* **607** 665; Barris B *et al.* 2004, *Astrophys. J.* **602** 571
- [2] Zlatev I, Wang L and Steinhardt P J 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** 896; Steinhardt P J, Wang L and Zlatev I 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **59** 123504; Carroll S M 1998 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** 3067; Wang L and Steinhardt P J 1998 *Astrophys. J.* **508** 483; Chiba T 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **60** 083508; Sahni V and Wang L 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 103517; Sahni V 2005, in *Cosmology and Gravitation, Xth Brazilian School of Cosmology and Gravitation*, Novello M and Perez-Bergliaffa S E eds., *AIP Conf. Proc.* **782** 166; Padmanabhan T, gr-qc/0503107; and references therein
- [3] Miller A D *et al.* 1999, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **524** L1; de Bernardis P *et al.* 2000, *Nature* **404** 955; Lange A E *et al.* 2001, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** 042001; Melchiorri A *et al.* 2000, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **536** L63; Hanany S *et al.* 2000, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **545** L5; Spergel D N *et al.* 2003, *Astrophys. J. (Suppl.)* **148** 175; Bennett C L *et al.* 2003, *Astrophys. J. (Suppl.)* **148** 1; Pearson T J *et al.* 2003, *Astrophys. J.* **591** 556; Benoit A *et al.* 2003, *Astron. Astrophys.* **399** L25
- [4] Alcaniz J S 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 083521; Melchiorri A *et al.* 2003, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 043509; Hannestad S and Mortsell E 2002, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 023510; Alam U, Sahni V, Saini T D and Starobinsky A A 2004 *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **354** 275; Nesseris S and Perivolaropoulos L 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 043531; Choudhury T R and Padmanabhan T 2004 *Astron. Astrophys.* **429** 807
- [5] Liddle A R and Lyth D H 2000 *Cosmological Inflation and Large-Scale Structure* (Cambridge: CUP)
- [6] Boisseau B, Esposito-Farese G, Polarski D, and Starobinsky A A 2000 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 2236
- [7] Faraoni V 2002 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11** 471
- [8] Caldwell R R 2002 *Phys. Lett. B* **545** 23
- [9] Caldwell R R, Kamionkowski M and Weinberg N N 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 071301; Carroll S M, Hoffman M and Trodden M 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 023509

- [10] Fang W *et al.*, preprint hep-th/0409080; Gonzalez-Diaz P F and Jimenez-Madrid J A 2004, *Phys. Lett. B* **596** 16; Brown M G , Freese K and Kinney W H , astro-ph/0405353; Elizalde E, Nojiri S and Odintsov S D 2004, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 043539; Hao J-G and Li X-Z 2005 *Phys. Lett. B* **606** 7; Aguirregabiria J M, Chimento L P and Lazkoz R 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 023509; Piao Y-S and Zhang Y-Z 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 063513; Gonzalez-Diaz P F 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 021303(R); 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 063522; 2004 *Phys. Lett. B* **586** 1; Lu H Q, hep-th/0312082; Johri V B 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 041303; Stefancic H 2004, *Phys. Lett. B* **586** 5; Liu D-J and Li X-Z 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 067301; Hao J-G and Li X-Z 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 043501; Li X-Z and Hao J-G 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 107303; Dabrowski M P, Stachowiak T and Szydlowski M 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 103519; Babichev E, Dokuchaev V and Eroshenko Yu 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** 021102; Guo Z-K, Piao Y-S and Zhang Y-Z 2004 *Phys. Lett. B* **594** 247; Hao J-G and Li X-Z 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 107303; Cline J M, Jeon S and Moore G D 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 043543; Nojiri S and Odintsov S D 2003 *Phys. Lett. B* **562** 147; Perivolaropoulos L 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 063503; 2005 *JCAP* **0510** 001; Nesseris S and Perivolaropoulos L 2004, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 123529; Vikman A 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 023515; Anisimov A, Babichev E and Vikman A 2005 *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **0506** 006; Stefancic H 2005, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 124306
- [11] Mersini L, Bastero-Gil M and Kanti P 2001 *Phys. Rev. D* **64** 043508; Bastero-Gil M, Frampton P H and Mersini L 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **65** 106002; Frampton P H 2003 *Phys. Lett. B* **555** 139; Nilles H P 1984 *Phys. Rep.* **110** 1; Barrow J D 1988 *Nucl. Phys. B* **310** 743; Pollock M D 1988 *Phys. Lett. B* **215** 635; Aref'eva I. Ya., astro-ph/0410443; Aref'eva I. Ya., Koshelev A S and Vernov S Yu, astro-ph/0412619; 2005 *Phys. Lett. B* **628** 1; Andrianov A A, Cannata F and Kamenshchik A Y, gr-qc/0505087; McInnes B 2005 *Nucl. Phys. B* **18**, 55; hep-th/0112066
- [12] Chiba T 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **60** 083508; Uzan J-P 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **59** 123510; Perrotta F, Baccigalupi C and Matarrese S 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **61** 023507; Amendola L 2000 *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **312** 521; de Ritis R, Marino A A and Scudellaro P 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 043506; Chen X, Scherrer R J and Steigman G 2001, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** 123504; Esposito-Farése G, gr-qc/0011115; Sen A A and Seshadri R T 2000, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **12** 445; Baccigalupi C, Matarrese S and Perrotta F 2000, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 123510; Fujii Y 2000 *Gravit. Cosmol.* **6** 107; Fujii Y and Nishioka T 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 044011; Bertolami O and Martins J 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **61** 064007; Amendola L 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 043511; 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 196; Bento M C, Bertolami O and Santos N C 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **65** 067301; Chiba T 2001 *Phys. Rev. D* **64** 103503; Riazuelo A and Uzan J-P 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **62** 083506; Esposito-Farése G and Polarski D 2001 *Phys. Rev. D* **63** 063504; Gunzig E *et al.* 2000, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** 1783; 2001 *Phys. Rev. D* **63** 067301; Saa A *et al.* 2001 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **40** 2295; Banerjee N and Pavon D 2001 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** 593; Faraoni V 2002 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **11** 471; Torres D

- F 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 043522; Perrotta F and Baccigalupi C, astro-ph/0205217; Nojiri S and Odintsov S D 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 123512; 2004 *Phys. Lett. B* **595** 1; 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 043538; Elizalde E *et al.* 2003 *Phys. Lett. B* **574** 1; Elizalde E, Nojiri S and Odintsov S D , hep-th/0405034; Matarrese S, Baccigalupi C and Perrotta F 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 061301; Catena R *et al.*, astro-ph/0406152
- [13] Faraoni V 2004, *Cosmology in Scalar-Tensor Gravity* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic)
- [14] Fujii Y and Maeda K 2003 *The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation* (Cambridge: CUP)
- [15] Singh P, Sami M and Dadhich N 2003, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 023522; Sami M and Toporensky A 2004 *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **19** 1509; Hao J-G and Li X-Z 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 043529; Chimento L P, Jakubi A S and Pavon D 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 083511; Sen A and Sen S 2001 *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **16** 1303
- [16] Faraoni V 2003 *Phys. Rev. D* **68** 063508
- [17] Faraoni V 2005 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** 3235
- [18] Barrow J D and Ottewill A C 1983 *J. Phys. A* **16** 2757
- [19] Navarro I and Van Acoleyen K, gr-qc/0511045
- [20] Clifton T and Barrow J D, gr-qc/0511036; 2006 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** L1; 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 103005
- [21] Maeda K and Ohta N 2004 *Phys. Lett. B* **597** 400; 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 063520; Ohta N 2005 *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **20** 1; Guo Z-K, Ohta N and Zhang Y-Z 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 023502
- [22] Faraoni V 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 044037; **69** 123520; **70** 047301
- [23] Bardeen J M 1980 *Phys. Rev. D* **22** 1882; Ellis G F R and Bruni M 1989 *Phys. Rev. D* **40** 1804; Ellis G F R, Hwang J-C and Bruni M 1989 *Phys. Rev. D* **40** 1819; Ellis G F R, Bruni M and Hwang J-C 1990 *Phys. Rev. D* **42** 1035; Hwang J-C and Vishniac E T 1990 *Astrophys. J.* **353** 1
- [24] Hwang J-C 1990 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **7** 1613; 1990 *Phys. Rev. D* **42** 2601; 1996 *Phys. Rev. D* **53** 762; 1997 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** 1981; 1997 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** 3327; 1998 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** 1401; 1998 *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** 1387; Hwang J-C and Noh H 1996 *Phys. Rev. D* **54** 1460
- [25] Cognola G and Zerbini S, hep-th/0511233; Cognola G, Elizalde E, Nojiri S, Odintsov S D and Zerbini S 2005 *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **02**, 010

- [26] La D and Steinhardt P J 1989 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** 376; Weinberg E J 1989 *Phys. Rev. D* **40** 3950; La D, Steinhardt P J and Bertschinger E 1989 *Phys. Lett. B* **231** 231; Liddle A R and Wands D 1991 *Mon. Not. Roy. Astr. Soc.* **253** 637; Accetta F S and Trester J J 1989 *Phys. Rev. D* **39** 2854; Holman R, Kolb E W and Wang Y 1990 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** 17; Holman R, Kolb E W, Vadas S and Wang Y 1991 *Phys. Lett. B* **269** 252; Laycock A M and Liddle A R 1994 *Phys. Rev. D* **49** 1827; McDonald J 1993 *Phys. Rev. D* **48** 2462
- [27] Carvalho F C and Saa A 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **70** 087302
- [28] Faraoni V 2000 *Phys. Lett. A* **269** 209
- [29] Chiba T 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **60** 083508; Umezū K, Ichiki K and Yahiro M 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 044010; Shirata R, Chiba T and Sugiyama N 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 064030; Nagata R, Chiba T and Sugiyama N 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 083512; Nagata R, Chiba T and Sugiyama N 2002 *Phys. Rev. D* **66** 103510
- [30] Komatsu E and Futamase T 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **59** 064029; 1998 *Phys. Rev. D* **58** 023004
- [31] Koh S, Kim S P and Song D J 2005 *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 043523
- [32] Tsujikawa S and Gumjudpai B 2004 *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 123523
- [33] Perrotta F, Baccigalupi C and Matarrese S 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **61** 023507; Faraoni V and Gunzig E 1999 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **8** 177
- [34] Sakai N and Yokoyama J 1999 *Phys. Lett. B* **456** 113; Chiba T 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **60** 83508; Hwang J-C and Noh H 1998 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** 5274; 1999 *Phys. Rev. D* **60** 123001; Kaiser D I 1995 *Phys. Rev. D* **52** 4295; Salopek D S 1992 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** 3602; Makino N and Sasaki M 1991 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **86** 103; Salopek D S, Bond J R and Bardeen J M 1989 *Phys. Rev. D* **40** 1753
- [35] Sakharov A D 1968 *Sov. Phys. (Doklady)* **12** 1040; Visser M 2002 *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **17** 977
- [36] Cooper F and Venturi G 1981 *Phys. Rev. D* **24** 3338
- [37] Turchetti G and Venturi G 1981 *Nuovo Cimento* **66B** 221; Pollock M D and Sahdev D 1989 *Phys. Lett. B* **222** 12; Fakir R and Unruh W G 1990 *Phys. Rev. D* **41** 1783; 1792 Green A M and Liddle A R 1996 *Phys. Rev. D* **54** 2557; Kaiser D I 1995 *Phys. Rev. D* **52** 4295; Cervantes-Cota J L and Dehnen H 1995 *Nucl. Phys. B* **442** 391; Cervantes-Cota J L and Chauvet P A 1998, in *Recent Developments in Gravitation and Mathematical Physics*, Garcia A , Lämmerzahl K, Matos T and Nunez D eds (Konstanz: Science Network Publishing)